

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT:

Parts I and II

for

STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS

under the

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT

As amended by the

No Child Left Behind Act of 2001

For reporting on

School Year 2007-08

GEORGIA



PART I DUE FRIDAY, DECEMBER 19, 2008

PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 2009

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202**

INTRODUCTION

Sections 9302 and 9303 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB) provide to States the option of applying for and reporting on multiple ESEA programs through a single consolidated application and report. Although a central, practical purpose of the Consolidated State Application and Report is to reduce "red tape" and burden on States, the Consolidated State Application and Report are also intended to have the important purpose of encouraging the integration of State, local, and ESEA programs in comprehensive planning and service delivery and enhancing the likelihood that the State will coordinate planning and service delivery across multiple State and local programs. The combined goal of all educational agencies—State, local, and Federal—is a more coherent, well-integrated educational plan that will result in improved teaching and learning. The Consolidated State Application and Report includes the following ESEA programs:

- Title I, Part A – Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies
- Title I, Part B, Subpart 3 – William F. Goodling Even Start Family Literacy Programs
- Title I, Part C – Education of Migratory Children (Includes the Migrant Child Count)
- Title I, Part D – Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk
- Title II, Part A – Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund)
- Title III, Part A – English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement Act
- Title IV, Part A, Subpart 1 – Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities State Grants
- Title IV, Part A, Subpart 2 – Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Activities (Community Service Grant Program)
- Title V, Part A – Innovative Programs
- Title VI, Section 6111 – Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities
- Title VI, Part B – Rural Education Achievement Program
- Title X, Part C – Education for Homeless Children and Youths

The NCLB Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2007-08 consists of two Parts, Part I and Part II.

PART I

Part I of the CSPR requests information related to the five ESEA Goals, established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application, and information required for the Annual State Report to the Secretary, as described in Section 1111(h)(4) of the ESEA. The five ESEA Goals established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application are:

- **Performance Goal 1: By SY 2013-14, all students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.**
- **Performance Goal 2: All limited English proficient students will become proficient in English and reach high academic standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.**
- **Performance Goal 3: By SY 2005-06, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.**
- **Performance Goal 4: All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug free, and conducive to learning.**
- **Performance Goal 5: All students will graduate from high school.**

Beginning with the CSPR SY 2005-06 collection, the Education of Homeless Children and Youths was added. The Migrant Child count was added for the SY 2006-07 collection.

PART II

Part II of the CSPR consists of information related to State activities and outcomes of specific ESEA programs. While the information requested varies from program to program, the specific information requested for this report meets the following criteria:

1. The information is needed for Department program performance plans or for other program needs.
2. The information is not available from another source, including program evaluations pending full implementation of required EDFacts submission.
3. The information will provide valid evidence of program outcomes or results.

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the SY 2007-08 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by Friday, December 19, 2008. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by Friday, February 27, 2009. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2007-08, unless otherwise noted.

The format states will use to submit the Consolidated State Performance Report has changed to an online submission starting with SY 2004-05. This online submission system is being developed through the Education Data Exchange Network (EDEN) and will make the submission process less burdensome. Please see the following section on transmittal instructions for more information on how to submit this year's Consolidated State Performance Report.

TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

The Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) data will be collected online from the SEAs, using the EDEN web site. The EDEN web site will be modified to include a separate area (sub-domain) for CSPR data entry. This area will utilize EDEN formatting to the extent possible and the data will be entered in the order of the current CSPR forms. The data entry screens will include or provide access to all instructions and notes on the current CSPR forms; additionally, an effort will be made to design the screens to balance efficient data collection and reduction of visual clutter.

Initially, a state user will log onto EDEN and be provided with an option that takes him or her to the "SY 2007-08 CSPR". The main CSPR screen will allow the user to select the section of the CSPR that he or she needs to either view or enter data. After selecting a section of the CSPR, the user will be presented with a screen or set of screens where the user can input the data for that section of the CSPR. A user can only select one section of the CSPR at a time. After a state has included all available data in the designated sections of a particular CSPR Part, a lead state user will certify that Part and transmit it to the Department. Once a Part has been transmitted, ED will have access to the data. States may still make changes or additions to the transmitted data, by creating an updated version of the CSPR. Detailed instructions for transmitting the SY 2007-08 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1965, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1810-0614. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 111 hours per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimates(s) contact School Support and Technology Programs, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW, Washington DC 20202-6140. Questions about the new electronic CSPR submission process, should be directed to the EDEN Partner Support Center at 1-877-HLPEDEN (1-877-457-3336).

OMB Number: 1810-0614

Expiration Date: 10/31/2010

Consolidated State Performance Report
For
State Formula Grant Programs
under the
Elementary And Secondary Education Act
as amended by the
No Child Left Behind Act of 2001

Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting:

Part I, 2007-08

Part II, 2007-08

Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report:
Georgia Department of Education

Address:
2066 Twin Towers East
Atlanta, GA 30334

Person to contact about this report:

Name: Jeff Gagne

Telephone: 404-656-3348

Fax: 404-651-6867

e-mail: jgagne@doe.k12.ga.us

Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type):
Kathy Cox, State Superintendent

Friday, March 13, 2009, 12:24:27 PM

Signature

Date

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART I**

For reporting on
School Year 2007-08



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 19, 2008
5PM EST**

1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

This section requests descriptions of the State's implementation of the NCLB academic content standards, academic achievement standards and assessments to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(1) of ESEA.

1.1.1 Academic Content Standards

In the space below, provide a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Responses should focus on actions taken or planned since the State's content standards were approved through ED's peer review process for State assessment systems. Indicate specifically in what school year your State expects the changes to be implemented.

If the State has not made or is not planning to make revisions or changes, respond "No revisions or changes to content standards taken or planned."

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Georgia's reading/language arts mathematics and science standards were subjected to a precision review in 2006. The precision review of the standards involved an Advisory Committee for each content area feedback from Local Education Agencies and an Educator Writing Team. The results of the precision review were reviewed by each Advisory Committee. Any changes or edits indicated by the review were submitted to the State Board of Education in July of 2006 for approval. The public was given the opportunity to submit comments via the GaDOE website and focus groups within the training sessions. The role of public comment was critical to the revision of the standards. The Georgia State Board of Education (SBOE) directed the GaDOE to perform yearly precision reviews to ensure the academic content standards accurately and fully describe what students in Georgia are expected to know and do at each grade level and/or high school course.

As of spring, 2008 the academic content standards in all assessed grade levels in reading/English language arts and science will be fully implemented into Georgia classrooms and state assessments as will grades 1 through 8 mathematics. High school mathematics will begin its implementation in the fall of 2008 with aligned End of Course assessments for Mathematics I. The high school mathematics curriculum will continue implementation with the incoming ninth grade class of 2008 progress through high school. As a result of the revisions in Georgia's academic content standards Georgia has passed new graduation requirements for students entering ninth grade in the fall of 2008. The new requirements include four years each of English language arts, mathematics, and science. Each content area has specified courses required for students to graduate from a Georgia high school.

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts

In the space below, provide a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's assessments and/or academic achievement standards in mathematics or reading/language arts required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA. Responses should focus on actions taken or planned since the State's assessment system was approved through ED's peer review process. Responses also should indicate specifically in what school year your State expects the changes to be implemented.

As applicable, include any assessment (e.g., alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards, alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards, native language assessments, or others) implemented to meet the assessment requirements under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA as well as alternate achievement standards for students with significant cognitive disabilities and modified academic achievement standards for certain students with disabilities implemented to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)

(3) of ESEA. Indicate specifically in what year your state expects the changes to be implemented.

If the State has not made or is not planning to make revisions or changes, respond "No revisions or changes to assessments and/or academic achievement standards taken or planned."

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Georgia's assessment system was approved by US ED in October 2007. Since that time, five additional assessments have completed the transition to the state's new curriculum, the Georgia Performance Standards (GPS). Specifically, mathematics assessments in grades 3, 4, 5, and 8 transitioned to the GPS in spring 2008, as did the English language arts assessments in grade 11. These assessments are currently undergoing peer review.

In Spring 2011, the transition to the GPS will be complete when the mathematics assessment in grade 11 is based on the GPS.

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

1.1.4 Assessments in Science

If your State's assessments and academic achievement standards in science required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA have been approved through ED's peer review process, provide in the space below a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's assessments and/or academic achievement standards in science required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA. Responses should focus on actions taken or planned since the State's assessment system was approved through ED's peer review process. Responses also should indicate specifically in what school year your State expects the changes to be implemented.

As applicable, include any assessment (e.g., alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards, alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards, native language assessments, or others) implemented to meet the assessment requirements under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA as well as alternate achievement standards for students with significant cognitive disabilities and modified academic achievement standards for certain students with disabilities implemented to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA.

If the State has not made or is not planning to make revisions or changes, respond "No revisions or changes to assessments and/or academic achievement standards taken or planned."

If the State's assessments in science required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA have not been approved through ED's peer review process, respond "State's assessments and academic achievement standards in science not yet approved."

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Georgia's science assessments and academic achievement standards are currently undergoing peer review.

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

This section collects data on the participation of students in the State NCLB assessments.

1.2.1 Participation of All Students in Mathematics Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of students enrolled during the State's testing window for NCLB mathematics assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA (regardless of whether the students were present for a full academic year) and the number of students who participated in the mathematics assessment in accordance with NCLB. The percentage of students who were tested for mathematics will be calculated automatically.

The student group "children with disabilities (IDEA)" includes children who participated in the regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments.

The student group "limited English proficient (LEP) students" includes recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months. Do not include former LEP students.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	832,083	829,100	99.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,263	1,262	99.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	25,727	25,664	99.8
Black, non-Hispanic	316,572	315,107	99.5
Hispanic	77,042	76,868	99.8
White, non-Hispanic	387,052	385,842	99.7
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	104,127	103,202	99.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	35,105	35,034	99.8
Economically disadvantaged students	431,627	429,969	99.6
Migratory students	1,712	1,708	99.8
Male	422,962	421,174	99.6
Female	409,121	407,926	99.7
Comments: Multi-racial students enrolled is 24427. Number participating is 24357.			

Source – The table above is produced through EDFacts. The SEA submits the data in file N/X081 that includes data group 588, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F, and subtotal 1. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Mathematics Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of children with disabilities (IDEA) participating during the State's testing window in mathematics assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA (regardless of whether the children were present for a full academic year) by the type of assessment. The percentage of children with disabilities (IDEA) who participated in the mathematics assessment for each assessment option will be calculated automatically. The total number of children with disabilities (IDEA) participating will also be calculated automatically.

The data provided below should include mathematics participation data from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. Do not include results from students covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	61,711	59.8
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	33,534	32.5
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	7,957	7.7
Total	103,202	

Comments: Data Verified

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

1.2.3 Participation of All Students in the Reading/Language Arts Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.1 and collects data on the State's NCLB reading/language arts assessment.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	831,669	827,420	99.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,261	1,256	99.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	25,742	25,269	98.2
Black, non-Hispanic	316,196	314,689	99.5
Hispanic	77,048	76,111	98.8
White, non-Hispanic	386,990	385,744	99.7
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	104,016	103,122	99.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	32,947	32,569	98.8
Economically disadvantaged students	431,324	428,801	99.4
Migratory students	1,715	1,672	97.5
Male	422,765	420,336	99.4
Female	408,885	407,072	99.6
Comments: Multi-racial students enrolled is 24426. Number participating is 24349.			

Source – The same file specification as 1.2.1 is used, but with data group 589 instead of 588.

1.2.4 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Reading/Language Arts Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.2 and collects data on the State's NCLB reading/language arts assessment.

The data provided should include reading/language arts participation data from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. Do not include results from students covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	28,089	27.2
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	67,066	65.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	7,967	7.7
Total	103,122	
Comments: Data has been verified. The difference is due to rounding in the N78 file for Reading/Language Arts because these are two separate assessments in Georgia.		

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

1.2.5 Participation of All Students in the Science Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.1 and collects data on the State's NCLB science assessment.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	833,240	829,388	99.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,264	1,260	99.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	25,763	25,700	99.8
Black, non-Hispanic	317,239	315,375	99.4
Hispanic	77,243	76,983	99.7
White, non-Hispanic	387,290	385,726	99.6
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	104,228	103,093	98.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	35,232	35,120	99.7
Economically disadvantaged students	432,345	430,099	99.5
Migratory students	1,716	1,712	99.8
Male	423,616	421,282	99.4
Female	409,624	408,106	99.6
Comments: Multi-racial students enrolled is 24441. Number participating is 24344.			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.2.6 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Science Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.2 and collects data on the State's NCLB science assessment.

The data provided should include science participation data from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. Do not include results from students covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	28,250	27.4
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	66,849	64.8
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	7,994	7.8
Total	103,093	
Comments: Data has been verified.		

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

This section collects data on student academic achievement on the State NCLB assessments.

1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics

In the format of the table below, provide the number of students who completed the State NCLB assessment(s) in mathematics implemented to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA (regardless of whether the students were present for a full academic year) and for whom a proficiency level was assigned, and the number of these students who scored at or above proficient, in grades 3 through 8 and high school. The percentage of students who scored at or above proficient is calculated automatically.

The student group "children with disabilities (IDEA)" includes children who participated in the regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments.

The student group "limited English proficient (LEP) students" does include recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months. Do not include former LEP students.

1.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts

This section is similar to 1.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State's NCLB reading/language arts assessment.

The student group "limited English proficient (LEP) students" does not include recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months. Do not include former LEP students.

1.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science

This section is similar to 1.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State's NCLB science assessment administered at least one in each of the following grade spans 3 through 5, 6 through 9, and 10 through 12.

Limited English Proficiency (LEP) students includes recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months. Do not include former LEP students.

1.3.1.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	127,172	90,610	71.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	172	122	70.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,761	3,420	90.9
Black, non-Hispanic	46,939	27,518	58.6
Hispanic	13,897	9,276	66.8
White, non-Hispanic	57,757	46,804	81.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	16,939	8,224	48.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	9,150	5,607	61.3
Economically disadvantaged students	70,465	42,808	60.8
Migratory students	343	201	58.6
Male	65,227	46,001	70.5
Female	61,945	44,609	72.0
Comments: Multi-racial students who completed assessment is 4646. Number scoring proficient is 3470.			

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: C SPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.2.1 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts -Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	126,970	114,145	89.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	172	157	91.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,698	3,553	96.1
Black, non-Hispanic	46,933	40,082	85.4
Hispanic	13,768	11,890	86.4
White, non-Hispanic	57,743	54,181	93.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	16,942	12,396	73.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	8,773	7,315	83.4
Economically disadvantaged students	70,334	59,957	85.3
Migratory students	335	276	82.4
Male	65,110	56,888	87.4
Female	61,847	57,247	92.6
Comments: Multi-racial students who completed assessment is 4647. Number scoring proficient is 4274.			

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: C SPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	127,093	95,083	74.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	172	128	74.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,762	3,326	88.4
Black, non-Hispanic	46,924	29,101	62.0
Hispanic	13,885	9,207	66.3
White, non-Hispanic	57,710	49,579	85.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	16,910	9,723	57.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	9,142	5,364	58.7
Economically disadvantaged students	70,415	45,273	64.3
Migratory students	343	211	61.5
Male	65,177	47,527	72.9
Female	61,916	47,556	76.8
Comments: Multi-racial students who completed assessment is 4640. Number scoring proficient is 3742.			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.3.1.2 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	124,133	87,412	70.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	208	164	78.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,829	3,434	89.7
Black, non-Hispanic	46,403	26,486	57.1
Hispanic	12,666	8,557	67.6
White, non-Hispanic	56,868	45,763	80.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	16,616	7,364	44.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,913	3,202	54.2
Economically disadvantaged students	67,582	40,456	59.9
Migratory students	275	159	57.8
Male	63,301	43,869	69.3
Female	60,832	43,543	71.6
Comments: Multi-racial students who completed assessment is 4159. Number scoring proficient is 3008.			

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: C SPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.2.2 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts -Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	123,914	107,753	87.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	210	193	91.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,759	3,562	94.8
Black, non-Hispanic	46,374	37,635	81.2
Hispanic	12,547	10,340	82.4
White, non-Hispanic	56,856	52,285	92.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	16,629	10,592	63.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,538	3,947	71.3
Economically disadvantaged students	67,429	54,713	81.1
Migratory students	270	191	70.7
Male	63,193	52,985	83.8
Female	60,706	54,758	90.2
Comments: Multi-racial students who completed assessment is 4159. Number scoring proficient is 3731.			

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: C SPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	124,065	91,958	74.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	208	180	86.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,828	3,375	88.2
Black, non-Hispanic	46,374	27,616	59.6
Hispanic	12,659	8,339	65.9
White, non-Hispanic	56,840	49,127	86.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	16,604	8,839	53.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,909	2,931	49.6
Economically disadvantaged students	67,536	42,344	62.7
Migratory students	275	144	52.4
Male	63,261	47,333	74.8
Female	60,804	44,625	73.4
Comments: Multi-racial students who completed assessment is 4156. Number scoring proficient is 3321.			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.3.1.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	122,045	103,060	84.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	171	149	87.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,812	3,638	95.4
Black, non-Hispanic	45,621	35,451	77.7
Hispanic	12,040	9,872	82.0
White, non-Hispanic	56,507	50,582	89.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	16,289	8,910	54.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,283	3,780	71.6
Economically disadvantaged students	65,498	50,850	77.6
Migratory students	271	194	71.6
Male	62,422	51,417	82.4
Female	59,623	51,643	86.6
Comments: Multi-racial students who completed assessment is 3894. Number scoring proficient is 3368.			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.2.3 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts -Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	121,848	111,472	91.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	172	155	90.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,746	3,609	96.3
Black, non-Hispanic	45,615	40,214	88.2
Hispanic	11,914	10,438	87.6
White, non-Hispanic	56,500	53,425	94.6
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	16,298	11,294	69.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,941	3,877	78.5
Economically disadvantaged students	65,355	57,133	87.4
Migratory students	265	198	74.7
Male	62,325	55,521	89.1
Female	59,509	55,943	94.0
Comments: Multi-racial students who completed assessment is 3893. Number scoring proficient is 3626.			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	121,996	87,384	71.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	170	131	77.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,811	3,284	86.2
Black, non-Hispanic	45,616	26,298	57.7
Hispanic	12,030	7,191	59.8
White, non-Hispanic	56,477	47,504	84.1
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	16,287	7,706	47.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,273	2,085	39.5
Economically disadvantaged students	65,468	38,834	59.3
Migratory students	271	131	48.3
Male	62,390	44,521	71.4
Female	59,606	42,863	71.9
Comments: Multi-racial students who completed assessment is 3892. Number scoring proficient is 2976.			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.3.1.4 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	120,930	84,302	69.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	175	130	74.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,743	3,367	90.0
Black, non-Hispanic	46,162	26,247	56.9
Hispanic	11,770	7,740	65.8
White, non-Hispanic	55,587	44,234	79.6
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	15,432	5,892	38.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,850	2,498	51.5
Economically disadvantaged students	64,406	37,640	58.4
Migratory students	270	145	53.7
Male	62,276	41,867	67.2
Female	58,654	42,435	72.3
Comments: Multi-racial students who completed assessment is 3493. Number scoring proficient is 2584.			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.2.4 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts -Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	120,703	107,997	89.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	176	167	94.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,678	3,500	95.2
Black, non-Hispanic	46,143	39,454	85.5
Hispanic	11,642	9,905	85.1
White, non-Hispanic	55,568	51,743	93.1
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	15,434	9,972	64.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,457	3,280	73.6
Economically disadvantaged students	64,240	54,407	84.7
Migratory students	270	194	71.9
Male	62,167	53,456	86.0
Female	58,525	54,534	93.2
Comments: Multi-racial students who completed assessment is 3493. Number scoring proficient is 3227.			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	120,835	80,353	66.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	175	126	72.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,742	3,183	85.1
Black, non-Hispanic	46,129	23,458	50.9
Hispanic	11,761	6,960	59.2
White, non-Hispanic	55,536	44,086	79.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	15,416	6,114	39.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,846	1,940	40.0
Economically disadvantaged students	64,350	34,268	53.3
Migratory students	270	126	46.7
Male	62,218	41,005	65.9
Female	58,617	39,348	67.1
Comments: Multi-racial students who completed assessment is 3492. Number scoring proficient is 2540.			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.3.1.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	120,473	96,701	80.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	194	167	86.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,686	3,469	94.1
Black, non-Hispanic	46,815	33,257	71.0
Hispanic	10,874	8,446	77.7
White, non-Hispanic	55,622	48,596	87.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	14,639	7,081	48.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,207	2,605	61.9
Economically disadvantaged students	63,170	45,342	71.8
Migratory students	237	153	64.6
Male	61,416	47,782	77.8
Female	59,057	48,919	82.8
Comments: Multi-racial students who completed assessment is 3282. Number scoring proficient is 2766.			

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: C SPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.2.5 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts -Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	120,337	107,188	89.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	194	179	92.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,624	3,427	94.6
Black, non-Hispanic	46,820	39,515	84.4
Hispanic	10,747	8,964	83.4
White, non-Hispanic	55,670	52,077	93.6
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	14,646	9,204	62.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,731	2,499	67.0
Economically disadvantaged students	63,034	52,730	83.7
Migratory students	231	154	66.7
Male	61,341	52,616	85.8
Female	58,987	54,566	92.5
Comments: Multi-racial students who completed assessment is 3281. Number scoring proficient is 3026.			

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: C SPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	120,403	91,027	75.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	193	161	83.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,691	3,321	90.0
Black, non-Hispanic	46,760	29,495	63.1
Hispanic	10,863	7,568	69.7
White, non-Hispanic	55,618	47,823	86.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	14,618	6,922	47.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,201	2,022	48.1
Economically disadvantaged students	63,074	40,648	64.4
Migratory students	237	123	51.9
Male	61,370	45,596	74.3
Female	59,033	45,431	77.0
Comments: Multi-racial students who completed assessment is 3278. Number scoring proficient is 2659.			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.3.1.6 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	121,679	95,950	78.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	205	164	80.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,701	3,470	93.8
Black, non-Hispanic	48,162	34,078	70.8
Hispanic	10,398	7,504	72.2
White, non-Hispanic	56,133	48,173	85.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	14,677	6,725	45.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,771	2,202	58.4
Economically disadvantaged students	62,679	43,691	69.7
Migratory students	237	154	65.0
Male	61,946	47,096	76.0
Female	59,733	48,854	81.8
Comments: Multi-racial students who completed assessment is 3080. Number scoring proficient is 2561.			

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: C SPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.2.6 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts -Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	121,489	111,432	91.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	205	192	93.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,635	3,482	95.8
Black, non-Hispanic	48,157	42,724	88.7
Hispanic	10,288	8,780	85.3
White, non-Hispanic	56,120	53,334	95.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	14,686	9,942	67.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,405	2,341	68.8
Economically disadvantaged students	62,556	54,678	87.4
Migratory students	231	152	65.8
Male	61,838	55,131	89.2
Female	59,643	56,296	94.4
Comments: Multi-racial students who completed assessment is 3079. Number scoring proficient is 2917.			

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: C SPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.3.6 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	121,417	73,419	60.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	205	134	65.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,696	2,972	80.4
Black, non-Hispanic	48,024	20,483	42.7
Hispanic	10,379	5,088	49.0
White, non-Hispanic	56,038	42,640	76.1
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	14,628	4,975	34.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,764	1,077	28.6
Economically disadvantaged students	62,488	28,434	45.5
Migratory students	237	83	35.0
Male	61,777	38,422	62.2
Female	59,640	34,997	58.7
Comments: Multi-racial students who completed assessment is 3075. Number scoring proficient is 2102.			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.3.1.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -High School

High School	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	92,668	70,654	76.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	137	103	75.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,132	2,852	91.1
Black, non-Hispanic	35,005	21,710	62.0
Hispanic	5,223	3,686	70.6
White, non-Hispanic	47,368	40,830	86.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	8,610	3,249	37.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,860	961	51.7
Economically disadvantaged students	36,169	22,959	63.5
Migratory students	75	47	62.7
Male	44,586	34,132	76.6
Female	48,082	36,522	76.0
Comments: Multi-racial students who completed assessment is 1803. Number scoring proficient is 1473.			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.2.7 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts -High School

High School	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	92,230	83,032	90.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	135	125	92.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,135	2,868	91.5
Black, non-Hispanic	34,655	29,440	85.0
Hispanic	5,210	4,273	82.0
White, non-Hispanic	47,293	44,622	94.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	8,493	4,969	58.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,733	990	57.1
Economically disadvantaged students	35,862	29,924	83.4
Migratory students	75	55	73.3
Male	44,368	39,049	88.0
Female	47,862	43,983	91.9
Comments: Multi-racial students who completed assessment is 1802. Number scoring proficient is 1704.			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Science -High School

High School	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	93,579	80,186	85.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	137	121	88.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,170	2,924	92.2
Black, non-Hispanic	35,548	27,242	76.6
Hispanic	5,406	4,203	77.7
White, non-Hispanic	47,507	44,057	92.7
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	8,630	4,767	55.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,985	1,141	57.5
Economically disadvantaged students	36,768	28,236	76.8
Migratory students	79	54	68.4
Male	45,089	38,945	86.4
Female	48,490	41,241	85.1
Comments: Multi-racial students who completed assessment is 1811 Number scoring proficient is 1639.			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY

This section collects data on the Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) status of schools and districts.

1.4.1 All Schools and Districts Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of schools and districts and the total number of those schools and districts that made AYP based on data for the SY 2007-08. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2007-08	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2007-08
Schools	2,153	1,721	79.9
Districts	184	55	29.9
Comments:			

Source – The table above is produced through ED Facts. The SEA submits the data in N/X103 for data group 32.

1.4.2 Title I School Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of public Title I schools by type and the total number of those schools that made AYP based on data for the SY 2007-08 school year. Include only public Title I schools. Do not include Title I programs operated by local educational agencies in private schools. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2007-08	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2007-08
All Title I schools	1,293	1,027	79.4
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	1,097	887	80.9
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	196	140	71.4
Comments:			

Source – The table above is produced through ED Facts. The SEA submits the data in N/X129 for data group 22 and N/X103 for data group 32.

1.4.3 Accountability of Districts That Received Title I Funds

In the table below, provide the total number of districts that received Title I funds and the total number of those districts that made AYP based on data for SY 2007-08. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2007-08	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2007-08
183	55	30.1
Comments: This information is based on AYP Determination Status for the 2008-2009, based on 2007-2008 school year results.		

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk.

Note: DG 582 is not collected from the SEA, rather it comes from the Title I funding data.

1.4.4 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

1.4.4.1 List of Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

In the following table, provide a list of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 for the SY 2008-09 based on the data from SY 2007-08. For each school on the list, provide the following:

- District Name and NCES ID Code
- School Name and NCES ID Code
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the school met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan

- Whether the school met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2008-09 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: School Improvement – Year 1, School Improvement – Year 2, Corrective Action, Restructuring Year 1 (planning), or Restructuring Year 2 (implementing))
- Whether (yes or no) the school is or is not a Title I school (This column must be completed by States that choose to list all schools in improvement. Column is optional for States that list only Title I schools.)
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003(a).
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003 (g).

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter school data.

Download template: [Question 1.4.4.1 \(Get MS Excel Viewer\)](#)

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

¹ The school improvement statuses are defined in LEA and School Improvement Non-Regulatory Guidance. This document may be found on the Department's Web page at <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/schoolimprovementguid.doc>.

1.4.4.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for schools in corrective action, provide the number of schools for which the listed corrective actions under NCLB were implemented in SY 2007-08 (based on SY 2006-07 assessments under Section 1111 of ESEA).

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2007-08
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	8
Extension of the school year or school day	5
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	17
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	9
Replacement of the principal	4
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	5
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	12
Comments: Schools were served through SI specialists who provided direct support for the development and implementation of the improvement plan.	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.4.4.4 Restructuring – Year 2

In the table below, for schools in restructuring – year 2 (implementation year), provide the number of schools for which the listed restructuring actions under NCLB were implemented in SY 2007-08 (based on SY 2006-07 assessments under Section 1111 of ESEA).

Restructuring Action	# of Title I Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	0
Reopening the school as a public charter school	0
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	0
Take over the school by the State	0
Other major restructuring of the school governance	27
Comments: Nineteen Schools in restructuring levels NI-7 and NI-8 entered into state improvement contracts with the GaDOE. Remaining schools in NI-5 and NI-6 were served through school improvement specialists who provided direct support for the development and implementation of each school's improvement plan.	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

In the space below, list specifically the "other major restructuring of the school governance" action(s) that were implemented.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.4.5 Districts That Received Title I Funds Identified for Improvement

1.4.5.1 List of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Were Identified for Improvement

In the following table, provide a list of districts that received Title I funds and were identified for improvement or corrective action under Section 1116 for the SY 2008-09 based on the data from SY 2007-08. For each district on the list, provide the following:

- District Name and NCES ID Code
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the district met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan

- Whether the district met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2008-09 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: Improvement or Corrective Action)
- Whether the district is a district that received Title I funds. Indicate "Yes" if the district received Title I funds and "No" if the district did not receive Title I funds. (This column **must be completed by States that choose to list all districts or all districts in improvement. This column is optional for States that list only districts in improvement that receive Title I funds.**)

- See attached for blank template that can be used to enter district data. Download template: [Question 1.4.5.1 \(Get MS Excel Viewer\)](#)

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

² The district improvement statuses are defined in LEA and School Improvement Non-Regulatory Guidance. This document may be found on the Department's Web page at <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/schoolimprovementguid.doc>.

1.4.5.2 Actions Taken for Districts That Received Title I Funds and Were Identified for Improvement

In the space below, briefly describe the measures being taken to address the achievement problems of districts identified for improvement or corrective action. Include a discussion of the technical assistance provided by the State (e.g., the number of districts served, the nature and duration of assistance provided, etc.).

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Since the NI status for a district hinges on the status of the schools within the school district, all of the school improvement resources services and structures (identified in 1.4.3.2) provided to schools are also aimed supporting districts too.

Moreover, for the 26 school districts in Georgia that have been identified for improvement (none have been identified for corrective action as of 2007-2008) district-level services were provided through the five School Improvement Regional Support Teams.

These services revolved around the contents of the Georgia System Improvement Fieldbook and the Data Utilization Guide. Services include assistance and resources in district-level school improvement planning data utilization and system level plan implementation. Some systems have also adopted the Georgia "School Keys: Unlocking Continuous Improvement" as a system level initiative and have been trained in conducting system led "internal" GAPSS (school performance audits). The School Keys are the foundation for Georgia's comprehensive, data-driven system of school improvement and support. Correlated to several well-known and respected research frameworks, the School Keys describe what Georgia's schools need to know, understand, and be able to do, in the same manner that the Georgia Performance Standards (GPS) describe what Georgia's students need to know, understand, and be able to do. Through the Georgia Assessment of Performance on School Standards diagnostic process (GAPSS Analysis), a variety of data are collected from multiple sources to assess the status of a school on each of the standards. The data are combined to inform the results of the GAPSS Analysis, which, in turn, informs the development and implementation of school improvement initiatives, including high impact practices, in a school. A Memorandum of Agreement with the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Council on Accreditation and School Improvement (SACS/CASI) details conditions under which the School Keys and GAPSS Analysis may count for a SACS/CASI Quality Assurance Review and accreditation visit.

The School Keys are intended to serve as a descriptor of effective, high impact practices for schools. In identifying these School Keys, the Division of School and Leader Quality of the Georgia Department of Education along with its collaborative partners aligned the School Keys with the research by Dr. Robert Marzano in the meta-analysis, *What Works in Schools* (2003), *School Leadership that Works*, (Marzano, Waters, and McNulty, 2003), and the Standards of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Council on Accreditation and School Improvement. The eleven factors identified by Dr. Marzano and similar terms and statements from the other research documents were combined until eight broad strands were determined to encompass the research: Curriculum; Instruction; Assessment; Planning and Organization; Student, Family, and Community Support; Professional Learning; Leadership; and School Culture. The eight strands have been further developed and defined into performance standards, linguistic rubrics, and elements/descriptors to assist schools in the process of school improvement.

The School Keys serve as a tool for all schools in the state. The document was field-tested during the 2004-2005 school year. Data from the field test were used to revise the School Keys for the 2005-2006 school year. An external validation study of the School Keys was conducted by the Georgia Partnership for Excellence in Education. This external validation included responses from and critiques by a national panel of experts in school improvement. Based on input from the external validation, further refinements were made to the School Keys, including clarification of language and the development of linguistic rubrics to guide the standards application process. The School Keys can be best utilized when combined with data collected using the Georgia Assessment of Performance on Schools Standards (GAPSS Analysis) instruments. The GAPSS Analysis provides the instruments and tools that can be applied to the School Keys strands to determine school needs and, based on quantitative and qualitative data collected from a variety of sources, chart the progress of the school. For more information on the School Keys, go to http://public.doe.k12.ga.us/tss_school.aspx

Services also include capacity building in school districts to enable the school districts to provide services to identified improvement corrective action and restructuring schools within the district.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.4.5.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for districts in corrective action, provide the number of districts in corrective action in which the listed corrective actions under NCLB were implemented in SY 2007-08 (based on SY 2006-07 assessments under Section 1111 of ESEA).

Corrective Action	# of Districts receiving Title I funds in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2007-08
Implementing a new curriculum based on State standards	0
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	0
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	0
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	0
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	0
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	0
Restructured the district	0
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2006-07 and beginning of SY 2007-08 as a corrective action)	0
Comments: No districts were in Corrective action in 2007-2008.	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.4.7 Appeal of AYP and Identification Determinations

In the table below, provide the number of districts and schools that appealed their AYP designations based on 2007-08 data and the results of those appeals.

	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts	1	0
Schools	79	20
Comments:		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2007-08 data was complete	07/31/08
---	----------

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.4.8 School Improvement Status

In the section below, "Schools in Improvement" means Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of ESEA for SY 2007-08.

1.4.8.1 Student Proficiency for Schools Receiving Assistance Through Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) Funds

The table below pertains only to schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08.

- In the SY 2007-08 column, provide the total number and percentage of students in schools receiving School Improvement funds in SY 2007-08 who were:
 - Proficient in mathematics as measured by your State's assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA in SY 2007-08.
 - Proficient in reading/language arts as measured by your State's assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA in SY 2007-08.
 - Total number of schools for which the data in this table are reported. This should be the total number of schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08.
- In the SY 2006-07 column, provide the requested data for the same schools whose student proficiency data are reported for SY 2007-08. No total is requested for schools in SY 2006-07.

Category	SY 2007-08	SY 2006-07
Total number of students who were enrolled in schools that received assistance through Section 1003 (a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	89,635	87,058
Total number of students who were proficient in mathematics in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	59,251	56,226
Percentage of students who were proficient in mathematics in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	66.1	64.6
Total number of students who were proficient in reading/language arts in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	69,545	71,862
Percentage of students who were proficient in reading/language arts in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	77.6	82.5
Number of schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	188	
Comments:		

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.4.8.2 School Improvement Status and School Improvement Assistance

In the table below, indicate the number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08 that:

- Made adequate yearly progress;
- Exited improvement status;
- Did not make adequate yearly progress.

Category	# of Schools
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08 that made adequate yearly progress based on testing in SY 2007-08	97
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08 that exited improvement status based on testing in SY 2007-08	38
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08 that did not make adequate yearly progress based on testing in SY 2007-08	91
Comments:	

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

Comments: Georgia's statewide system of support provides school improvement services to all schools and local education agencies (LEAs) through regional support teams. These teams are comprised of a cadre of former superintendents principals and teachers with expertise in school leadership curriculum instruction continuous school improvement and specific academic content areas such as mathematics. In addition regional support teams may request the services of outside experts based on the needs of individual schools. Georgia delivers statewide support through five (5) school improvement regions. Each region has a regional support team comprised of up to five (5) system leaders. Each system leader is assigned up to 10 LEAs. The system leader is responsible for providing professional learning continuous school improvement planning based on Georgia School Standards and student specific data unique to each LEA. In addition to system leaders each region is assigned a regional leadership facilitator whose primary responsibility is to provide professional learning in mathematics curriculum and instruction. A second regional leadership facilitator is focused on coordinating the work of and supporting programs for at-risk students. System leaders also work in collaboration with Regional Educational Service Agency (RESA) school improvement specialists to support schools that are identified for improvement and schools that did not make AYP for one year. In addition to regional leadership facilitators the GaDOE also employs school-level leadership

facilitators. These facilitators were assigned to schools in Improvement, Corrective action, and Restructuring schools and provide on-site support. The level of services provided to schools depends on the number of years a school has been identified for Improvement, Corrective action, or Restructuring. For schools identified for Corrective Action a school-level leadership facilitator is assigned to work with school-level administrators and school building leadership teams one day per week. School-level leadership facilitators provide guidance in developing continuous school improvement plans using the tools and resources developed by the GaDOE. They also provide professional learning on data utilization conduct classroom observations, model classroom instruction, and conduct awareness walks designed to collect formative data on classroom practices. In addition they serve as the lead on collaborative school teams established to analyze data and redesign instruction based on data. Schools identified for restructuring receive a more intense level of support. A school-level leadership facilitator is assigned to provide on-site support to schools two days per week, and these schools are required to enter into a contract with the Georgia State Board of Education to meet specific improvement strategies outlined in the contract. Another on-site support expert is the contract monitor who is responsible for monitoring the school's progress toward meeting contract milestones. In addition, schools identified for restructuring receive a mandatory GAPSS. Georgia Assessment of Performance on School Standards (GAPSS) is a formalized process to assess schools implementation of Georgia schools standards. Georgia School Standards defines the eight strands for effective schools Curriculum Assessment Instruction Planning and Organization, Parent and Community Involvement, Professional Learning Leadership, and School Culture. Rubrics to assess the school's level of implementation are included for each standard to help each school identify its current performance in relation to the standard identifying strengths and determining areas for growth. In order to ensure that schools have instructional tools to address their weakness members of the school staff must participate in Raising Standards, GaDOE developed professional learning program that provides processes and strategies for teaching mathematics and ELA.

Column 1 Response Options Box

- 1 = Provide customized technical assistance and/or professional development that is designed to build the capacity of LEA and school staff to improve schools and is informed by student achievement and other outcome-related measures.
- 2 = Utilize research-based strategies or practices to change instructional practice to address the academic achievement problems that caused the school to be identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.
- 3 = Create partnerships among the SEA, LEAs and other entities for the purpose of delivering technical assistance, professional development, and management advice.
- 4 = Provide professional development to enhance the capacity of school support team members and other technical assistance providers who are part of the Statewide system of support and that is informed by student achievement and other outcome-related measures.
- 5 = Implement other strategies determined by the SEA or LEA, as appropriate, for which data indicate the strategy is likely to result in improved teaching and learning in schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.
- 6 = Combination 1: Schools using a combination of strategies from above. Please use Column 2 to indicate which of the above strategies comprise this combination.
- 7 = Combination 2: Schools using a combination of strategies from above. Please use Column 2 to indicate which of the above strategies comprise this combination.
- 8 = Combination 3: Schools Using a combination of strategies from above. Please use Column 2 to indicate which of the above strategies comprise this combination.

Column 6 Response Options Box

A = Improvement by at least five percentage points in two or more AYP reporting cells

B = Increased teacher retention

C = Improved parental involvement

D = Other

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB

831.

1.4.8.4 Sharing of Effective Strategies

In the space below, describe how your State shared the effective strategies identified in item 1.4.8.3 with its LEAs and schools. Please exclude newsletters and handouts in your description.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Georgia's statewide system of support provides school improvement services to all schools and local education agencies (LEAs). Services are provided to all schools through School Improvement Specialists who are assigned to improvement, corrective action, and restructuring schools and provide on-site support. Support to schools focuses on implementation of the Georgia School Standards, utilization of the Georgia Assessment of Progress on School Standards (GAPSS) process, and use of research-based strategies from the Implementation Resource.5.1

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

1.4.8.5 Use of Section 1003(a) and (g) School Improvement Funds

Note: New section for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.4.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations

In the space provided, enter the percentage of the FY 2007 (SY 2007-08) Title I, Part A allocation that the SEA reserved in accordance with Section 1003(a) of ESEA and §200.100(a) of ED's regulations governing the reservation of funds for school improvement under Section 1003(a) of ESEA: 5.1 %

Comments:

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.4.8.5.2 Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) Allocations to LEAs and Schools

In the tables below, provide the requested information for FY 2007 (SY 2007-08).

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter allocation data.

Download template: [Question 1.4.8.5.2 \(Get MS Excel Viewer\)](#)

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

1.4.8.5.3 Use of Section 1003(g)(8) Funds for Evaluation and Technical Assistance

Section 1003(g)(8) of ESEA allows States to reserve up to five percent of Section 1003(g) funds for administration and to meet the evaluation and technical assistance requirements for this program. In the space below, identify and describe the specific Section 1003(g) evaluation and technical assistance activities that your State conducted during SY 2007-08.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Georgia was approved for Differentiated Accountability. Part of the plan includes an increase in the intensity of interventions for schools in restructuring including the initiation of a state-directed contract which includes the following non-negotiable elements:

1. Assignment of a Georgia Department of Education (GaDOE) state director to the school. The state director will be assigned to the school full time (NI 7-9) and will provide direct supervision in the implementation of all school improvement actions;
2. GaDOE personnel assigned to the school will be directly involved in decisions regarding the replacement of staff (e.g., principal);
3. Implement the instructional frameworks in each classroom;
4. Administer benchmark framework assessments and analyze results to guide instruction;
5. Implement short-term action plans;
6. Analyze teacher attendance and develop action plans if needed;
7. Analyze student attendance and develop action plans if needed;
8. Analyze discipline records and develop action plans if needed;
9. Address targeted areas from the Georgia Analysis of Performance on School Standards (GAPPS) through short-term action plans;
10. Participate in the Georgia Analysis of Performance on School Standards at levels 5 and 7;
11. Participate in GaDOE professional learning for state directed schools;
12. Hire instructional coaches for specific content area needs, based on AYP results.

Title I, Part A 1003 (g) administration funds support the technical assistance provided to the schools and LEAS.

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

1.4.8.6 Actions Taken for Title I Schools Identified for Improvement Supported by Funds Other than Those of Section 1003(a) and 1003(g).

In the space below, describe actions (if any) taken by your State in SY 2007-08 that were supported by funds other than Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) funds to address the achievement problems of schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of ESEA.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

State funds were allocated for school improvement personnel and professional learning to provide support to all schools and LEAs regarding the implementation of the Georgia School Standards, utilization of the Georgia Assessment of Progress on School Standards (GAPSS) process, and use of research-based strategies from the Implementation Resource. These resources and support ensure the use of a continuous improvement model focused on the development and implementation of improvement plans aligned to the area in which the school did not make Adequate Yearly Progress.

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB

83l.

1.4.9 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on public school choice and supplemental educational services.

1.4.9.1 Public School Choice

This section collects data on public school choice. FAQs related to the public school choice provisions are at the end of this section.

1.4.9.1.2 Public School Choice – Students

In the table below, provide the number of students who were eligible for public school choice, the number of eligible students who applied for public school choice, and the number who transferred under the provisions for public school choice in Section 1116 of ESEA.

Students who are eligible for public school choice includes:

- (1) Students currently enrolled in a school identified for improvement, corrective action or restructuring.
- (2) Students who transferred in the current school year under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116, and
- (3) Students who previously transferred under Section 1116 and are continuing to transfer for the current school year under Section 1116.

	# Students
Eligible for public school choice	157,748
Applied to transfer	13,514
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	5,795

Indicate in the table below the categories of students that are included in the count of eligible students.

	Yes/No
Enrolled in a school identified for improvement	Yes
Transferred in the current school year, only	Yes
Transferred in a prior year and in the current year	No
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk.

1.4.9.1.3 Funds Spent on Public School Choice

In the table below, provide the total dollar amount spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice in Section 1116 of ESEA.

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$ 5,617,759
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk.

1.4.9.1.4 Availability of Public School Choice Options

In the table below provide the number of LEAs in your State that are unable to provide public school choice options to eligible students due to any of the following reasons:

1. All schools at a grade level are in school improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.
2. LEA only has a single school at the grade level of the school at which students are eligible for public school choice
3. LEA's schools are so remote from one another that choice is impracticable.

	# LEAs
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	23
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

FAQs about public school choice:

a. How should States report data on Title I public school choice for those LEAs that have open enrollment and other choice programs?

An LEA may consider a student as eligible for and participating in Title I public school choice, and may consider costs for transporting that student towards its funds spent on transportation for public school choice, if the student meets the following conditions:

- Has a "home" or "neighborhood" school (to which the student would have been assigned, in the absence of a choice program) that receives Title I funds and has been identified, under the statute, as in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring; and
- Has elected to enroll, at some point since July 1, 2002 (the effective date of the Title I choice provisions), and after the home school has been identified as in need of improvement, in a school³ that has not been so identified and is attending that school; and
- Is using district transportation services to attend such a school.

b. How do States report on public school choice for those LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice (e.g., LEAs in which all schools in a grade level are in school improvement, LEAs that have only a single school at that grade level, or LEAs whose schools are so remote from one another that choice is impracticable)? For those LEAs, States should count as eligible all students who attend identified Title I schools. States should report that no eligible schools or students were provided the option to transfer and should provide an explanation why choice is not possible within the LEA in the Comment Section.

³ Adapted from OESE/OII policy letter of August 2004. The policy letter may be found on the Department's Web page at <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/stateletters/choice/choice081804.html>.

1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

1.4.9.2.2 Supplemental Educational Services – Students

In the table below, provide the number of students who were eligible for, who applied for, and who received supplemental educational services under Section 1116 of ESEA.

	# Students
Eligible for supplemental educational services	77,576
Applied for supplemental educational services	15,320
Received supplemental educational services	9,924
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk.

1.4.9.2.3 Funds Spent on Supplemental Educational Services

In the table below, provide the total dollar amount spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services under Section 1116 of ESEA.

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$ 8,870,562
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk.

1.5 TEACHER QUALITY

This section collects data on "highly qualified" teachers as the term is defined in Section 9101(23) of ESEA.

1.5.1 Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified

In the table below, provide the number of core academic classes for each of the school types listed and the number of those core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified (as the term is defined in Section 9101(23) of ESEA) and the number taught by teachers who are not highly qualified. The percentage of core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified and the percentage taught by teachers who are not highly qualified will be calculated automatically. Below the table are FAQs about these data. The percentages used for high-and low-poverty schools and the poverty metric used to determine those percentages are reported in 1.5.3.

School Type	# of Core Academic Classes (Total)	# of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	# of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified
All schools	273,242	265,946	97.3	7,296	2.7
Elementary level					
High-poverty schools	22,819	21,826	95.6	993	4.4
Low-poverty schools	25,683	25,308	98.5	375	1.5
All elementary schools	88,702	86,554	97.6	2,148	2.4
Secondary level					
High-poverty schools	26,032	24,521	94.2	1,511	5.8
Low-poverty schools	58,673	57,901	98.7	772	1.3
All secondary schools	184,540	179,392	97.2	5,148	2.8
Comments:					

Do the data in Table 1.5.1 above include classes taught by special education teachers who provide direct instruction core academic subjects?

Data table includes classes taught by special education teachers who provide direct instruction core academic subjects.

Yes

If the answer above is no, please explain below. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Does the State count elementary classes so that a full-day self-contained classroom equals one class, or does the State use a departmentalized approach where a classroom is counted multiple times, once for each subject taught?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The state counts full-day self-contained elementary classrooms as one one elementary class.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

FAQs about highly qualified teachers and core academic subjects:

- a. *What are the core academic subjects? English, reading/language arts, mathematics, science, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history, and geography [Title IX, Section 9101(11)]. While the statute includes the arts in the core academic subjects, it does not specify which of the arts are core academic subjects; therefore, States must make this determination.*
- b. *How is a teacher defined? An individual who provides instruction in the core academic areas to kindergarten, grades 1 through 12, or ungraded classes, or individuals who teach in an environment other than a classroom setting (and who maintain daily student attendance records) [from NCES, CCD, 2001-02]*
- c. *How is a class defined? A class is a setting in which organized instruction of core academic course content is provided to one or more students (including cross-age groupings) for a given period of time. (A course may be offered to more than one class.) Instruction, provided by one or more teachers or other staff members, may be delivered in person or via a different medium. Classes that share space should be considered as separate classes if they function as separate units for more than 50% of the time [from NCES Non-fiscal Data Handbook for Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education, 2003].*
- d. *Should 6th-, 7th-, and 8th-grade classes be reported in the elementary or the secondary category? States are responsible for determining whether the content taught at the middle school level meets the competency requirements for elementary or secondary instruction. Report classes in grade 6 through 8 consistent with how teachers have been classified to determine their highly qualified status, regardless of whether their schools are configured as elementary or middle schools.*
- e. *How should States count teachers (including specialists or resource teachers) in elementary classes? States that count self-contained classrooms as one class should, to avoid over-representation, also count subject-area specialists (e.g., mathematics or music teachers) or resource teachers as teaching one class. On the other hand, States using a departmentalized approach to instruction where a self-contained classroom is counted multiple times (once for each subject taught) should also count subject-area specialists or resource teachers as teaching multiple classes.*
- f. *How should States count teachers in self-contained multiple-subject secondary classes? Each core academic subject taught for which students are receiving credit toward graduation should be counted in the numerator and the denominator. For example, if the same teacher teaches English, calculus, history, and science in a self-contained classroom, count these as four classes in the denominator. If the teacher were Highly Qualified to teach English and history, he/she would be counted as Highly Qualified in two of the four subjects in the numerator.*
- g. *What is a "high-poverty school"? Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "high-poverty" schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State. The poverty quartile breaks are reported later in this section.*
- h. *What is a "low-poverty school"? Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "low-poverty" schools as schools in the bottom quartile of poverty in the State. The poverty quartile breaks are reported later in this section.*

1.5.2 Reasons Core Academic Classes Are Taught by Teachers Who Are Not Highly Qualified

In the table below, estimate the percentages for each of the reasons why teachers who are not highly qualified teach core academic classes. For example, if 900 elementary classes were taught by teachers who are not highly qualified, what percentage of those 900 classes falls into each of the categories listed below? If the three reasons provided at each grade level are not sufficient to explain why core academic classes at a particular grade level are taught by teachers who are not highly qualified, use the row labeled "other" and explain the additional reasons. The total of the reasons is calculated automatically for each grade level and must equal 100% at the elementary level and 100% at the secondary level.

Note: Use the numbers of core academic classes taught by teachers who are not highly qualified from 1.5.1 for both elementary school classes (1.5.2.1) and for secondary school classes (1.5.2.2) as your starting point.

	Percentage
Elementary School Classes	
Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	26.0
Elementary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	3.0
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	71.0
Other (please explain in comment box below)	
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

	Percentage
Secondary School Classes	
Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers)	33.0
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	1.0
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	66.0
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.0
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

NA

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

In the table below, provide the poverty quartiles breaks used in determining high-and low-poverty schools and the poverty metric used to determine the poverty quartiles. Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

	High-Poverty Schools (more than what %)	Low-Poverty Schools (less than what %)
Elementary schools	76.0	36.0
Poverty metric used		
Secondary schools	76.0	36.0
Poverty metric used	Free and Reduced Lunch	
Comments: Data were checked and verified.		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

- a. *How are the poverty quartiles determined? Separately rank order elementary and secondary schools from highest to lowest on your percentage poverty measure. Divide the list into four equal groups. Schools in the first (highest group) are high-poverty schools. Schools in the last group (lowest group) are the low-poverty schools. Generally, States use the percentage of students who qualify for the free or reduced-price lunch program for this calculation.*
- b. *Since the poverty data are collected at the school and not classroom level, how do we classify schools as either elementary or secondary for this purpose? States may include as elementary schools all schools that serve children in grades K through 5 (including K through 8 or K through 12 schools) and would therefore include as secondary schools those that exclusively serve children in grades 6 and higher.*

1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

This section collects annual performance and accountability data on the implementation of Title III programs.

1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs

In the table below, place a check next to each type of language instruction educational programs implemented in the State, as defined in Section 3301(8), as required by Sections 3121(a)(1), 3123(b)(1), and 3123(b)(2).

Table 1.6.1 Definitions:

1. **Types of Programs = Types of programs described in the subgrantee's local plan (as submitted to the State or as implemented) that is closest to the descriptions in <http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/expert/glossary.html>.**
2. **Other Language = Name of the language of instruction, other than English, used in the program.**

Check Types of Programs	Type of Program	Other Language
No	Dual language	
No	Two-way immersion	
No	Transitional bilingual	
No	Developmental bilingual	
No	Heritage language	
Yes	Sheltered English instruction	
No	Structured English immersion	
No	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)	
Yes	Content-based ESL	
Yes	Pull-out ESL	
Yes	Other (explain in comment box below)	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

LEAs also use the Push-In and SIOP models. The Push-In model allow the ESOL or ESOL Endorsed teacher to enter the regular education classroom and work directly with the ELL students. The SIOP Model or Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol, is the use of specific strategies to teach content areas so that they are comprehensible to students while promoting their English language development. SIOP was created to provide teachers with with a well articulated and practical model of sheltered instruction that facilitates high quality instruction for ELLs in content areas.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.6.2 Student Demographic Data

1.6.2.1 Number of ALL LEP Students in the State

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of ALL LEP students in the State. LEP students are defined as all students assessed for English language proficiency (ELP) using an annual State ELP assessment as required under Section 1111(b)(7) of ESEA in the reporting year and who meet the LEP definition in Section 9101(25).

- Include newly enrolled (recent arrivals to the U.S.) and continually enrolled LEP students, whether or not they receive services in a Title III language instruction educational program
- Do not include Former LEP students (as defined in Section 200.20(f)(2) of the Title I regulation) and monitored Former LEP students (as defined in Section 3121(a)(4) of Title III) in the ALL LEP student count in this table.

Number of ALL LEP students in the State	79,894
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool. Note: New or substantially revised

question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

1.6.2.2 Number of LEP Students Who Received Title III Language Instruction Educational Program Services

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of the number of LEP students who received services in Title III language instructional education programs.

	#
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	65,815
Comments:	

Source – The SEA submits the data in file N/X116 that contains data group ID 648, category set A.

1.6.2.3 Most Commonly Spoken Languages in the State

In the table below, provide the five most commonly spoken languages, other than English, in the State (for all LEP students, not just LEP students who received Title III Services). The top five languages should be determined by the highest number of students speaking each of the languages listed.

Language	# LEP Students
Spanish	63,811
Vietnamese	2,151
Korean	2,083
Other African	1,483
Chinese	1,063

Report additional languages with significant numbers of LEP students in the comment box below. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other Indian 932 French 840 Portuguese 833 Other European 779 Other Asian 739 Russian 595 Gujarati 575 Arabic 457 Amharic, Tigrinya, Tigre 383 Haitian Creole 383 Hindi 364 Japanese 329 Somali 273 Farsi, Dari, Persian 235 Hmong 215 Khmer, Cambodian 188 German 172 Lao 167 Turkish 162 Filipino, Tagalog 160 Akan, Twi, Fanti, Housa 126 Thai 90 Urdu 61 Hebrew 58 Italian 48 Polish 46 Swahili 34 Dutch 27 Ukrainian 26 Bulgarian 25 Czech/Slovak 23 Romanian 23 Swedish 18 Bosnian 16 American Indian 15 Greek 12 Maya 5 Croatian 5 Englishes other than Standard American English 5 Nahuatl 5 Punjabi 4 Hungarian 3 Mixteco 2 Zapoteco 1

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.6.3 Student Performance Data

This section collects data on LEP student English language proficiency, as required by Sections 1111(h)(4)(D) and 3121(b)(1).

1.6.3.1.1 ALL LEP Participation in State Annual English Language Proficiency Assessment

In the table below, please provide the number of ALL LEP students tested on annual State English language proficiency assessment (as defined in 1.6.2.1).

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	71,112
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	8,782
Total	79,894
Comments: Number tested used ACCESS file matched to Student Record, regardless if student had a score. Total includes distinct student IDs so students are not counted more than once if they move, no Pre-K in grade level and no missing grade level. Only LEP-Y	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool. Note: New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR.

Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

	#
Number proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	8,536
Percent proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	10.7
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool. Note: New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR.

Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.6.3.2.1 Title III LEP Participation in English Language Proficiency

In the table below, provide the number of Title III LEP students participating in the annual State English language proficiency assessment.

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	60,129
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	5,686
Total	65,815
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool. Note: New or substantially revised

question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

1.6.3.2.2 Title III LEP English Language Proficiency Results

In the table below, provide the results from the annual State English language proficiency assessment for Title III-served LEP students who participated in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12.

Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:

1. **Making Progress = Number of Title III LEP students who met the definition of "Making Progress" as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.**
2. **ELP Attainment = Number of Title III LEP students who attained English language proficiency as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.**
3. **Results = Number and percent of Title III LEP students who met the State definition of "Making Progress" and the number and percent that met the State definition of "Attainment" of English language proficiency.**

	Results	
	#	%
Making progress	39,543	65.8
ELP attainment	6,300	10.5
Comments:		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments

This section collects data on LEP students assessed in their native language (Section 1111(b)(6)) to be used for AYP determinations.

1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language

In the table below, check "yes" if the specified assessment is used for AYP purposes.

State offers the State reading/language arts content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
State offers the State mathematics content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
State offers the State science content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
Comments: Georgia does not assess LEP students in their native languages.	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool. Note: New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

1.6.3.5.2 Native Language of Mathematics Tests Given

In the table below, report the language(s) in which native language assessments are given for NCLB accountability determinations for mathematics.

Language(s)
None
Comments: Georgia does not assess LEP students in their native languages.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.6.3.5.3 Native Language of Reading/Language Arts Tests Given

In the table below, report the language(s) in which native language assessments are given for NCLB accountability determinations for reading/language arts.

Language(s)
None
Comments: Georgia does not assess LEP students in their native languages.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.6.3.5.4 Native Language of Science Tests Given

In the table below, report the language(s) in which native language assessments are given for NCLB accountability determinations for science.

Language(s)
None
Comments: Georgia does not assess LEP students in their native languages.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool. Note: New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR.

Proposed under OMB 831.

1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP Students

This section collects data on the performance of former LEP students as required by Sections 3121(a)(4) and 3123(b)(8).

1.6.3.6.1 Title III Served MFLEP Students by Year Monitored

In the table below, report the unduplicated count of monitored former LEP students during the two consecutive years of monitoring, which includes both MFLEP students in AYP grades and in non-AYP grades.

Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) students include:

- Students who have transitioned out of a language instruction educational program funded by Title III into classrooms that are not tailored for LEP students.
- Students who are no longer receiving LEP services and who are being monitored for academic content achievement for 2 years after the transition.

Table 1.6.3.6.1 Definitions:

1. **# Year One = Number of former LEP students in their first year of being monitored.**
2. **# Year Two = Number of former LEP students in their second year of being monitored.**
3. **Total = Number of monitored former LEP students in year one and year two. This is automatically calculated.**

# Year One	# Year Two	Total
8,331	6,910	15,241
Comments:		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.6.3.6.2 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students Results for Mathematics

In the table below, report the number of monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students who took the annual mathematics assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned into classrooms not designed for LEP students and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

Table 1.6.3.6.2 Definitions:

1. **# Tested = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in mathematics in all AYP grades.**
2. **# At or Above Proficient = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual mathematics assessment.**
3. **% Results = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the number tested.**
4. **# Below proficient = State-aggregated number MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual mathematics assessment. This will be automatically calculated.**

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
12,317	10,380	84.3	1,937
Comments:			

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.6.3.6.3 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students Results for Reading/Language Arts

In the table below, report results monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students who took the annual reading/language arts assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned into classrooms not designed for LEP students and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

Table 1.6.3.6.3 Definitions:

1. **# Tested = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in reading/language arts in all AYP grades.**
2. **# At or Above Proficient = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual reading/language arts assessment.**
3. **% Results = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the total number tested.**
4. **# Below proficient = State-aggregated number MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual reading/language arts assessment. This will be automatically calculated.**

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
12,318	11,179	90.8	1,139
Comments: Reading:			
11,950 11,182 93.6 768			

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.6.3.6.4 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students Results for Science

In the table below, report results for monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students who took the annual science assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned into classrooms not designed for LEP students and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

Table 1.6.3.6.4 Definitions:

1. **# Tested = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in science.**
2. **# At or Above Proficient = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual science assessment.**
3. **% Results = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the number tested.**
4. **# Below proficient = State-aggregated number MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual science assessment. This will be automatically calculated.**

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
8,590	6,147	71.6	2,443
Comments:			

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool. Note: New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR.

Proposed under OMB 831.

1.6.4 Title III Subgrantees

This section collects data on the performance of Title III subgrantees.

1.6.4.1 Title III Subgrantee Performance

In the table below, report the number of Title III subgrantees meeting the criteria described in the table. Do not leave items blank. If there are zero subgrantees who met the condition described, put a zero in the number (#) column. Do not double count subgrantees by category.

Note: Do not include number of subgrants made under Section 3114(d)(1) from funds reserved for education programs and activities for immigrant children and youth. (Report Section 3114(d)(1) subgrants in 1.6.5.1 ONLY.)

	#
Total number of subgrantees for the year	185
Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	175
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	182
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	177
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	181
Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	0
Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2006-07 and 2007-08)	10
Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2007-08 for not meeting Title III AMAOs	10
Number of subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2004-05, 2005-06, 2006-07, and 200708)	0
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.6.4.2 State Accountability

In the table below, indicate whether the State met all three Title III AMAOs.

Note: Meeting all three Title III AMAOs means meeting each State-set target for each objective: Making Progress, Attaining Proficiency, and Making AYP for the LEP subgroup. This section collects data that will be used to determine State AYP, as required under Section 6161.

State met <u>all</u> three Title III AMAOs	<u>No</u>
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.6.4.3 Termination of Title III Language Instruction Educational Programs

This section collects data on the termination of Title III programs or activities as required by Section 3123(b)(7).

Were any Title III language instruction educational programs or activities terminated for failure to reach program goals?	No
If yes, provide the number of language instruction educational programs or activities for immigrant children and youth terminated.	
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students

This section collects data on education programs and activities for immigrant students.

1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students

In the table below, report the unduplicated number of immigrant students enrolled in the State and who participated in qualifying educational programs under Section 3114(d)(1).

Table 1.6.5.1 Definitions:

1. **Immigrant Students Enrolled = Number of students who meet the definition of immigrant children and youth in Section 3301(6) and enrolled in the elementary or secondary schools in the State.**
2. **Students in 3114(d)(1) Program = Number of immigrant students who participated in programs for immigrant children and youth funded under Section 3114(d)(1), using the funds reserved for immigrant education programs/activities. This number should not include immigrant students who receive services in Title III language instructional educational programs under Sections 3114(a) and 3115(a).**
3. **3114(d)(1) Subgrants = Number of subgrants made in the State under Section 3114(d)(1), with the funds reserved for immigrant education programs/activities. Do not include Title III LIEP subgrants made under Sections 3114(a) and 3115(a) that serve immigrant students enrolled in them.**

# Immigrant Students Enrolled	# Students in 3114(d)(1) Program	# of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants
33,866	24,137	138

If state reports zero (0) students in programs or zero (0) subgrants, explain in comment box below. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk.

1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development

This section collects data on teachers in Title III language instruction education programs as required under Section 3123(b)(5).

1.6.6.1 Teacher Information

This section collects information about teachers as required under Section 3123 (b)(5).

In the table below, report the number of teachers who are working in the Title III language instruction educational programs as defined in Section 3301(8) and reported in 1.6.1 (Types of language instruction educational programs) even if they are not paid with Title III funds.

Note: Section 3301(8) – The term 'Language instruction educational program' means an instruction course – (A) in which a limited English proficient child is placed for the purpose of developing and attaining English proficiency, while meeting challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards, as required by Section 1111(b)(1); and (B) that may make instructional use of both English and a child's native language to enable the child to develop and attain English proficiency and may include the participation of English proficient children if such course is designed to enable all participating children to become proficient in English and a second language.

	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	1,889
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	1,250

Explain in the comment box below if there is a zero for any item in the table above.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Total teachers needed in the next five years take into consideration teacher attrition through retirement, change in profession and other reasons as well as anticipated growth in the ELL population.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

* This number should be the total additional teachers needed for the next 5 years, not the number needed for each year. Do not include the number of teachers currently working in Title III English language instruction educational programs.

1.6.6.2 Professional Development (PD) Activities of Subgrantees Related to the Teaching and Learning of LEP Students

In the table below, provide information about the subgrantee professional development activities that meets the requirements of Section 3115(c)(2).

Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:

1. **Professional Development Topics = Subgrantee activities for professional development topics required under Title III.**
2. **# Subgrantees = Number of subgrantees who conducted each type of professional development activity. A subgrantee may conduct more than one professional development activity. (Use the same method of counting subgrantees, including consortia, as in 1.6.1.1 and 1.6.4.1.)**
3. **Total Number of Participants = Number of teachers, administrators and other personnel who participated in each type of the professional development (PD) activities reported.**
4. **Total = Number of all participants in PD activities.**

Type of Professional Development Activity	# Subgrantees	
Instructional strategies for LEP students	128	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	165	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	95	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	95	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	160	
Other (Explain in comment box)	78	
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	125	10,819
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	95	1,825
PD provided to principals	108	1,864
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	125	1,450
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	78	580
PD provided to community based organization personnel	78	210
Total	125	16,748

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

These totals include the small regional focus group meetings to provide the most current information and training tools. Select Sub-Grantees offer online ESOL Endorsement training through distance learning.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities

This section collects data on State grant activities.

1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process

In the table below, report the time between when the State receives the Title III allocation from ED, normally on July 1 of each year for the upcoming school year, and the time when the State distributes these funds to subgrantees for the intended school year. Dates must be in the format MM/DD/YY.

Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:

1. **Date State Received Allocation = Annual date the State receives the Title III allocation from US Department of Education (ED).**
2. **Date Funds Available to Subgrantees = Annual date that Title III funds are available to approved subgrantees.**
3. **# of Days/\$\$ Distribution = Average number of days for States receiving Title III funds to make subgrants to subgrantees beginning from July 1 of each year, except under conditions where funds are being withheld.**

Example: State received SY 2007-08 funds July 1, 2007, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2007, for SY 2007-08 programs. Then the "# of days/\$\$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
08/01/07	08/14/07	37
Comments: Allocations were made to Sub-Grantees immediately following the Georgia State Board of Education (SBOE) approval. Allocations could not be made to LEAs until the SBOE's approval was granted on August 9, 2007.		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.6.7.2 Steps To Shorten the Distribution of Title III Funds to Subgrantees

In the comment box below, describe how your State can shorten the process of distributing Title III funds to subgrantees. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The process can be shortened by allowing the Finance and Budget Office (FBO) to make allocations immediately upon the Superintendent receiving the allocation letter, instead of having to wait until the next monthly SBOE meeting to gain approval.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS

In the table below, provide the number of schools identified as persistently dangerous, as determined by the State, by the start of the school year. For further guidance on persistently dangerous schools, refer to Section B "Identifying Persistently Dangerous Schools" in the Unsafe School Choice Option Non-Regulatory Guidance, available at: <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/unsafeschoolchoice.pdf>.

	#
Persistently Dangerous Schools	0
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.8 GRADUATION RATES AND DROPOUT RATES

This section collects graduation and dropout rates.

1.8.1 Graduation Rates

In the table below, provide the graduation rates calculated using the methodology that was approved as part of the State's accountability plan for the previous school year (SY 2006-07). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Graduation Rate
All Students	72.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	65.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	86.2
Black, non-Hispanic	65.5
Hispanic	60.3
White, non-Hispanic	77.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	32.9
Limited English proficient	46.4
Economically disadvantaged	63.1
Migratory students	31.1
Male	68.7
Female	75.8
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

FAQs on graduation rates:

- a. *What is the graduation rate? Section 200.19 of the Title I regulations issued under the No Child Left Behind Act on December 2, 2002, defines graduation rate to mean:*
 - The percentage of students, measured from the beginning of high school, who graduate from public high school with a regular diploma (not including a GED or any other diploma not fully aligned with the State's academic standards) in the standard number of years; or,
 - Another more accurate definition developed by the State and approved by the Secretary in the State plan that more accurately measures the rate of students who graduate from high school with a regular diploma; and
 - Avoids counting a dropout as a transfer.
- b. *What if the data collection system is not in place for the collection of graduate rates? For those States that are reporting transitional graduation rate data and are working to put into place data collection systems that will allow the State to calculate the graduation rate in accordance with Section 200.19 for all the required subgroups, please provide a detailed progress report on the status of those efforts.*

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

This is graduation rate data for the graduating Class of 2007.

1.8.2 Dropout Rates

In the table below, provide the dropout rates calculated using the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's (NCES) Common Core of Data (CCD) for the previous school year (SY 2006-07). Below the table is a FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Dropout Rate
All Students	4.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	4.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	1.5
Black, non-Hispanic	4.3
Hispanic	5.0
White, non-Hispanic	4.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	5.8
Limited English proficient	5.1
Economically disadvantaged	4.7
Migratory students	6.8
Male	4.9
Female	3.4
Comments: This is dropout data for the 2006-2007 school year (grades 9-12).	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

FAQ on dropout rates:

What is a dropout? A dropout is an individual who: 1) was enrolled in school at some time during the previous school year; and 2) was not enrolled at the beginning of the current school year; and 3) has not graduated from high school or completed a State-or district-approved educational program; and 4) does not meet any of the following exclusionary conditions: a) transfer to another public school district, private school, or State-or district-approved educational program (including correctional or health facility programs); b) temporary absence due to suspension or school-excused illness; or c) death.

1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS PROGRAM

This section collects data on homeless children and youths and the McKinney-Vento grant program.

In the table below, provide the following information about the number of LEAs in the State who reported data on homeless children and youths and the McKinney-Vento program. The totals will be will be automatically calculated.

	#	# LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	106	102
LEAs with subgrants	31	30
Total	137	132
Comments: This information was obtained from the GaDOE's Student Information System (SIS). One subgrantee failed to report data to the SIS. Four non-grantees failed to submit surveys.		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.9.1 All LEAs (with and without McKinney-Vento subgrants)

The following questions collect data on homeless children and youths in the State.

1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youths

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youths by grade level enrolled in public school at any time during the regular school year. The totals will be automatically calculated:

Age/Grade	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs With Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	69	185
K	481	1,153
1	489	1,161
2	442	1,143
3	408	1,091
4	409	949
5	362	843
6	372	804
7	371	771
8	350	768
9	306	809
10	219	536
11	131	408
12	211	459
Ungraded	0	0
Total	4,620	11,080
Comments: This information was obtained from the GaDOE's Student Information System (SIS). One subgrantee failed to report data to the SIS.		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.9.1.2 Primary Nighttime Residence of Homeless Children and Youths

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youths by primary nighttime residence enrolled in public school at any time during the regular school year. The primary nighttime residence should be the student's nighttime residence when he/she was identified as homeless. The totals will be automatically calculated.

	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs With Subgrants
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	976	4,274
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	4,057	11,362
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	247	284
Hotels/Motels	1,313	2,009
Total	6,593	17,929
Comments: This information was obtained from the GaDOE's Student Information System (SIS). One subgrantee failed to report data to the SIS. The numbers do not match because the information came from two different sources and gathered at different times.		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.9.2 LEAs with McKinney-Vento Subgrants

The following sections collect data on LEAs with McKinney-Vento subgrants.

1.9.2.1 Homeless Children and Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Subgrants

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youths by grade level who were served by McKinney-Vento subgrants during the regular school year. The total will be automatically calculated.

Age/Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	185
K	1,153
1	1,161
2	1,143
3	1,091
4	949
5	843
6	804
7	771
8	768
9	809
10	536
11	408
12	459
Ungraded	0
Total	11,080
Comments: This information was obtained from the GaDOE's Student Information System (SIS). One subgrantee failed to report data to the SIS.	

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk.

1.9.2.2 Subpopulations of Homeless Students Served

In the table below, please provide the following information about the homeless students served during the regular school year.

	# Homeless Students Served
Unaccompanied youth	1,732
Migratory children/youth	130
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	3,670
Limited English proficient students	1,614
Comments: This information was obtained from the Annual Education for Homeless Children and Youth Survey. All grantees submitted data. Four non-grantees failed to report data to this source.	

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk.

1.9.2.3 Educational Support Services Provided by Subgrantees

In the table below, provide the number of subgrantee programs that provided the following educational support services with McKinney-Vento funds.

	# McKinney-Vento Subgrantees That Offer
Tutoring or other instructional support	30
Expedited evaluations	25
Staff professional development and awareness	31
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	31
Transportation	31
Early childhood programs	27
Assistance with participation in school programs	31
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	31
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	31
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	31
Coordination between schools and agencies	31
Counseling	31
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	26
Clothing to meet a school requirement	28
School supplies	31
Referral to other programs and services	31
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	31
Other (optional – in comment box below)	0
Other (optional – in comment box below)	0
Other (optional – in comment box below)	0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

This information was obtained from the Annual Education for Homeless Children and Youth Survey.
All grantees submitted data.
Four non-grantees failed to report data to this source.

Source – Manual input by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.9.2.4 Barriers To The Education Of Homeless Children And Youth

In the table below, provide the number of subgrantees that reported the following barriers to the enrollment and success of homeless children and youths.

	# Subgrantees Reporting
Eligibility for homeless services	8
School Selection	9
Transportation	19
School records	13
Immunizations	14
Other medical records	9
Other Barriers – in comment box below	7

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other Barriers:

Instability of housing; instability of school placement; transportation; uniform policy; no central registration for middle and high school students; guardianship; clothing; housing; book fines; instability of nighttime housing.

This information was obtained from the Annual Education for Homeless Children and Youth Survey.

All grantees submitted data.

Four non-grantees failed to report data to this source.

1.9.2.5 Academic Progress of Homeless Students

The following questions collect data on the academic achievement of homeless children and youths served by McKinney-Vento subgrants.

1.9.2.5.1 Reading Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youths served who were tested on the State NCLB reading/language arts assessment and the number of those tested who scored at or above proficient. Provide data for grades 9 through 12 only for those grades tested for NCLB.

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Reading Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	1,381	940
4	1,212	698
5	1,073	726
6	1,052	660
7	958	609
8	1,003	665
High School	546	297
Comments: This information was obtained from the GaDOE's Student Information System (SIS). One subgrantee failed to report data to the SIS.		

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

1.9.2.5.2 Mathematics Assessment

This section is similar to 1.9.2.5.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State NCLB mathematics assessment.

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Mathematics Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	1,381	553
4	1,212	461
5	1,073	606
6	1,052	395
7	958	503
8	1,003	450
High School	546	318
Comments: This information was obtained from the GaDOE's Student Information System (SIS). One subgrantee failed to report data to the SIS.		

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

1.10 MIGRANT CHILD COUNTS

This section collects the Title I, Part C, Migrant Education Program (MEP) child counts which States are required to provide and may be used to determine the annual State allocations under Title I, Part C. The child counts should reflect the reporting period of September 1, 2007 through August 31, 2008. This section also collects a report on the procedures used by States to produce true, accurate, and valid child counts.

To provide the child counts, each SEA should have sufficient procedures in place to ensure that it is counting only those children who are eligible for the MEP. Such procedures are important to protecting the integrity of the State's MEP because they permit the early discovery and correction of eligibility problems and thus help to ensure that only eligible migrant children are counted for funding purposes and are served. If an SEA has reservations about the accuracy of its child counts, it must inform the Department of its concerns and explain how and when it will resolve them in Section 1.10.3.4 Quality Control Processes.

Note: In submitting this information, the Authorizing State Official must certify that, to the best of his/her knowledge, the child counts and information contained in the report are true, reliable, and valid and that any false Statement provided is subject to fine or imprisonment pursuant to 18 U.S.C. 1001.

FAQs on Child Count:

How is "out-of-school" defined? Out-of-school means youth up through age 21 who are entitled to a free public education in the State but are not currently enrolled in a K-12 institution. This could include students who have dropped out of school, youth who are working on a GED outside of a K-12 institution, and youth who are "here-to-work" only. It does not include preschoolers, who are counted by age grouping.

How is "ungraded" defined? Ungraded means the children are served in an educational unit that has no separate grades. For example, some schools have primary grade groupings that are not traditionally graded, or ungraded groupings for children with learning disabilities. In some cases, ungraded students may also include special education children, transitional bilingual students, students working on a GED through a K-12 institution, or those in a correctional setting. (Students working on a GED outside of a K-12 institution are counted as out-of-school youth.)

1.10.1 Category 1 Child Count

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number by age/grade of eligible migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, resided in your State for one or more days during the reporting period of September 1, 2007 through August 31, 2008. This figure includes all eligible migrant children who may or may not have participated in MEP services. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

- Children age birth through 2 years
- Children served by the MEP (under the continuation of services authority) after their period of eligibility has expired when other services are not available to meet their needs
- Previously eligible secondary-school children who are receiving credit accrual services (under the continuation of services authority).

Age/Grade	12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	730
K	857
1	554
2	479
3	435
4	442
5	372
6	344
7	380
8	285
9	341
10	231
11	142
12	112
Ungraded	N<10
Out-of-school	4,416
Total	10,124
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk.

1.10.1.1 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases

In the space below, explain any increases or decreases from last year in the number of students reported for Category 1 greater than 10 percent.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The decrease is less than 10%.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.10.2 Category 2 Child Count

In the table below, enter by age/grade the unduplicated statewide number of eligible migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, were served for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods that occurred within the reporting period of September 1, 2007 through August 31, 2008. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. Count a child who moved to different schools within the State and who was served in both traditional summer and year-round school intersession programs only once. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

- Children age birth through 2 years
- Children served by the MEP (under the continuation of services authority) after their period of eligibility has expired when other services are not available to meet their needs
- Previously eligible secondary-school children who are receiving credit accrual services (under the continuation of services authority).

Age/Grade	Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	116
K	322
1	189
2	168
3	156
4	116
5	138
6	82
7	69
8	83
9	39
10	31
11	N<10
12	0
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	21
Total	1,539
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

1.10.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases

In the space below, explain any increases or decreases from last year in the number of students reported for Category 2 greater than 10 percent.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The increase from last year in the number of students reported for Category 2 is greater than 10% due to the fact the state worked diligently to increase services during the summer.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.10.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures

The following question requests information on the State's MEP child count calculation and validation procedures.

1.10.3.1 Student Information System

In the space below, respond to the following questions: What system(s) did your State use to compile and generate the Category 1 and Category 2 child count for this reporting period (e.g., NGS, MIS 2000, COEStar, manual system)? Were child counts for the last reporting period generated using the same system(s)? If the State's category 2 count was generated using a different system from the category 1 count, please identify each system.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

COEstar was used to compile and generate the Category 1 and Category 2 child counts for this reporting period. The child counts for the last reporting period were also generated using the COEstar system.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.10.3.2 Data Collection and Management Procedures

In the space below, respond to the following questions: How was the child count data collected? What data were collected? What activities were conducted to collect the data? When were the data collected for use in the student information system? If the data for the State's category 2 count were collected and maintained differently from the category 1 count, please describe each set of procedures.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Upon enrollment in the Migrant Education Program (MEP), information from the Data Entry Form (DEF) is entered into the electronic Certificate of Eligibility (COE) in COEstar by a trained Georgia Department of Education Migrant Education Agency (MEA) data specialist or a trained back up.

Data on the DEF includes:

1. Family data (parent/guardian name(s), family language, current address, and home base)
2. Child data (name, sex, race, date of birth, birthplace, school, grade, and school enrollment date)
3. Eligibility data (where moved from, where moved to, with/to join or on his/her own move, date of move, qualifying worker, qualifying activity, employer, whether work is seasonal or temporary, whether work is agricultural or fishing related, whether work is the principle means of livelihood)
4. Residency date
5. Comments explaining migrant work history and qualifying activity as identified in the eligibility section
6. Other data (previous school enrollments, etc.)
7. Parent/Guardian and recruiter signatures

All of the above information is obtained through a face-to-face interview with the family, generally at their residence or workplace by a trained regional MEA office GaDOE recruiter/employee or a trained LEA migrant staff person. Occasionally, the family interview occurs when parents come to the school to register their children. In all cases, the DEF is completed and submitted to the appropriate regional MEA office for processing.

DEFs are completed on each new family/self-eligible youth identified by the MEA recruiter/employee or LEA staff during the initial interview. Identification and recruitment (ID & R) activities are carried out year round. Occasionally, ID & R activities are conducted as a part of other MEA or LEA activities, e.g., summer festivals, migrant health fairs.

Note: This information pertains to both the Category 1 and Category 2 counts.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

In the space below, describe how the child count data are inputted, updated, and then organized by the student information system for child count purposes at the State level The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The GaDOE employs a single, full-time MEP state data collections coordinator and a full-time state data specialist. Each MEA regional office has one full time data specialist. In addition, each of these regional data specialists has one colleague in the office trained on the COEstar system to back her up should she have an extended absence or require assistance during a period of heavy work. The primary responsibility of the state data collections coordinator is to monitor/maintain the statewide data system, update the data in COEstar and the national migrant student information exchange (MSIX) system, as well as generate reports and queries as requested by the GaDOE and the LEAs.

Each week the data specialists from each of the four regional offices send electronic copies of their COEstar database to the state data specialist. (Each regional office has a complete statewide copy of the COEstar database.) The state data specialist synchronizes each copy, running checks to catch any duplication, errors, and/or missing data. If problems with the data are detected, the state data specialist sends an e-mail to the appropriate MEA data specialist, the appropriate MEA coordinator, and the state program director, explaining the problem. When the MEA data specialist has corrected the problem, she sends a secure e-mail with the corrections to inform the state data specialist, the state program director, and the MEA office coordinator that the problematic data have been corrected. When this review process is complete, the state data specialist then uploads an updated, corrected copy of the COEstar database to each MEA data specialist.

Because each regional MEA office and the State Data Collections Office have complete copies of the COEstar database, many errors and duplicates are caught at the regional level. Each month the state data collections coordinator prepares a performance report to provide an overview of every aspect of the COEstar database for the state program director. If the state program director sees any problems, these are communicated by e-mail to the state data collections coordinator for resolution.

If the data for the State's category 2 count were collected and maintained differently from the category 1 count, please describe each set of

procedures.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The data for both counts were collected and maintained using the same set of procedures.

1.10.3.3 Methods Used To Count Children

In the space below, respond to the following question: How was each child count calculated? Please describe the compilation process and edit functions that are built into your student information system(s) specifically to produce an accurate child count. In particular, describe how your system includes and counts only:

- children who were between age 3 through 21;
- children who met the program eligibility criteria (e.g., were within 3 years of a last qualifying move, had a qualifying activity);
- children who were resident in your State for at least 1 day during the eligibility period (September 1 through August 31);
- children who—in the case of Category 2—received a MEP-funded service during the summer or intersession term; and
- children once per age/grade level for each child count category.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The GaMEP uses the following processes to calculate each child count:

Children who were between age 3 through 21; Children who met the program eligibility criteria (e.g., were within 3 years of a last qualifying move, had a qualifying activity)

Response: COEstar is programmed to produce a count based on all the eligibility criteria contained in the federal statute.

Children who were resident in your State for at least one day during the eligibility period (9/1-8/31)

Response: COEstar's Performance Reporter first examines the family's current address on the COE to be sure that they are in the state. It then tests numerous dates to determine if a contact event or sequence of events occurred that would definitely show that the child resided in the state during the period. These include checking the school year listed on school enrollment records, the qualifying arrival date(QAD), residency dates, enrollment dates, withdrawal dates, departure dates, LEP, needs assessment, graduation/termination dates, special services dates, and health record dates performed in the state during the period. Records are excluded from counting if departure dates indicate that they left before the period began, or if additional records demonstrate that the child was no longer in the state when the period began.

Children who -in the case of category 2 -received an MEP-funded service during the summer or intersession term:

Response: Each summer or intersession term, the local project director forwards a report to the regional MEA office containing the number of eligible migrant children or youth who received services (instructional or support) at least one day during the summer or intersession term. The data regarding the particulars of the services are entered into the individual student's information/school history line in COEstar.

Children once per age/grade level for each child count category

Response: The state data collections coordinator runs COEstar's Performance Reporter, which has a number of programmed interventions to count migrant children only once, state wide, for the period specified in the state data collections coordinator query. Some of these interventions include checking names that are the same or similar, checking the maiden name of the child's mother, and checking the date and place of birth, the QAD, etc..

If your State's category 2 count was generated using a different system from the category 1 count, please describe each system separately.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Category 2 count was generated using the same system as the Category 1 count.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.10.3.4 Quality Control Processes

In the space below, respond to the following question: What steps are taken to ensure your State properly determines and verifies the eligibility of each child included in the child counts for the reporting period of September 1 through August 31 before that child's data are included in the student information system(s)?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

It is the goal of the Georgia MEP to achieve and maintain 100% accuracy in its recruiting processes. Important new quality control steps and processes have been implemented in recent years at the MEA level to improve the GaDOE's ability to ensure and verify the accuracy of eligibility determinations prior to or immediately after entering eligibility information in the COEstar system. They are:

Ongoing Recruiter Training

All MEA and LEA migrant staff members are provided mandatory ID & R training throughout the year. They attend in-services on: The Migrant Education Program The role of recruitment How to apply the eligibility section of the Non-Regulatory Guidance How to resolve difficult recruitment cases How to conduct interviews How to fill out a DEF The Identification and Recruitment Handbook Effective recruitment techniques Records maintenance/documentation

All program staff members (including LEA funded staff) are required to attend these training sessions. The staff are required to pass a series of assessments to certify their understanding of the state's recruiting policies and guidelines. Passing scores will be mandatory in order to receive a satisfactory annual evaluation from program administrators. All full time recruiters are required to meet at least once every quarter with the state ID & R coordinator to review any change in guidelines, discuss policies, procedures, and to discuss and resolve difficult or ambiguous recruitment cases. All newly hired recruiting staff participate in an initial three day recruitment training session prior to beginning any recruitment effort for the state. All new recruiters also have all their paperwork fully screened by an experienced recruiter until they successfully complete at least ten enrollments with no errors that would require follow up with the families.

Data Entry Form (DEF) Processing

Statewide uniformity at the MEA level in processing DEFs for data system entry is as follows:

MEA recruiters/employees recruit families or youth by completing a DEF in a face-to-face interview.

Written information recorded during the interview is verbally reviewed by the recruiter/employee for accuracy. The recruiter/employee then signs the form and asks the interviewee to sign as well.

The pink copy is immediately given to the interviewee as a record of the eligibility interview.

The original (white copy), along with the recruiter or LEA copy (yellow) goes to the regional data specialist.

The DEF is date stamped upon arrival at the regional office.

The data specialist reviews the DEF for completion to ensure that all boxes are marked and that the DEF is filled out according to the state's completion instructions as described in the GaDOE MEP ID & R Handbook (2007 Edition).

If the DEF meets all of the necessary criteria, the data specialist initials it in the top right hand corner. It is then given to the regional MEA office coordinator for final review and approval.

If the data specialist sees that an item is missing or believes that an item needs clarification, she records the date and concern(s) in a log, retains a copy of the DEF, and returns the original white and yellow copy to the recruiter/employee who conducted the interview. The request is made in writing that the recruiter/employee correct and/or provide additional comments or corrections. The recruiter/employee is required to go back to the family for any additional information and both must initial the changes on the form. A data specialist can correct and initial spelling mistakes without having to notify the recruiter or family/youth.

As mentioned, the data specialist maintains a list of concerns that are encountered, and the name of the recruiter/employee submitting the DEF in question. This assists in monitoring errors as they arise. The regional MEA office is responsible for (1) resolving outstanding issues/discrepancies and (2) providing feedback and training to individual recruiters as the need arises.

All DEFs receive regional MEA office coordinator verification and approval prior to being entered into the COEstar system. A signature line is included on the original and yellow copy of the DEF for this purpose.

As errors and discrepancies are resolved, the information on the DEF is entered into the COEstar system.

The original DEF and the electronic COE are maintained at the regional office.

A COEstar generated notification or "Friendly COE" form is mailed to the LEA after its approval to provide systems with basic program

eligibility information.

The data specialists and recruiters/employees work as a team. They consult with each other to resolve issues and answer questions that may arise. If there are issues that the data specialists and recruiters/employees are unable to resolve independently, they will consult with the regional MEA office coordinators immediately to resolve the issues.

Any issues, which the region is unable to resolve independently, are referred to the state ID & R coordinator. If at any time the state ID & R coordinator is unable to answer the question, it is referred to the Migrant Education Office within the United States Department of Education in Washington, DC for assistance.

Should a question arise from any source regarding an eligibility determination made on a child, the state takes action on the question or concern by requesting that a re-interview be conducted. The form that is utilized is the same as that used in the random sample rolling re-interview process and is available from the State MEP Data Collections Office. The process for evaluating the eligibility determination follows that of the rolling re-interview process.

The state, itself, is solely responsible for reviewing and monitoring the quality of its migrant student eligibility documentation as it relates to the annual child count, including student eligibility data related to attendance in regular year and summer/intersession projects. All eligibility decisions are finalized and made by the coordinator in each of the state's regional MEA offices prior to the delivery of any MEP services. Every child's eligibility documentation is included for selection in the random sample process associated with the quality control efforts of the state's rolling re-interviews.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

In the space below, describe specifically the procedures used and the results of any re-interview processes used by the SEA during the reporting period to test the accuracy of the State's MEP eligibility determinations. In this description, please include the number of eligibility determinations sampled, the number for which a test was completed, and the number found eligible.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

On the first working day of each month, the MEP Data Collections Office runs a query generating a statewide list of COEs entered the month before. The same office determines the random sample size required for the month in each MEA region, either five percent or ten COEs, whichever is greater. The random selection is done following the protocol established by the state data collections coordinator. More than the required amount is pulled to allow for substitutions due to moves or the inability to locate interviewees.

Exceptions: a.If a region does not generate at least 64 COEs during a given month (except for the month of August,for which quality control must take place in September regardless of the number of COEs),the MQC for the region will be postponed until the following month, or until the region has generated at least 64 COEs. 15% of 64 COEs is equal to ten re-interviews. b.Some migrant workers are more highly mobile than others. This fact could mean that a migrant worker has already departed and is no longer in residence during the MQC period. When a region experiences a high degree of migrant mobility and the MQC process is continually turning up workers who have already departed -thus making it difficult for the region to meet its monthly re-interview requirement -the following procedure should be followed: A region may cease in its effort to meet the monthly QC quota only after the region has attempted to contact at least 15% of the COEs generated during the previous month. At that point, it is sufficient to cease the effort because it has clearly been documented that there was a high level of migrant mobility and that, in all likelihood, the original eligibility determinations were accurate. Documenting that an individual/family has departed requires three attempts (visits) or confirmation from a reliable source (other family member, crew leader, farmer, school official) that the individual/family has departed. In both exception cases, the regional MEA coordinator will electronically inform the state ID & R coordinator which situation has occurred. This communique will become a permanent part of that month's MQC analysis for the state. The data specialists make photocopies of the original DEF corresponding to each COE selected. The DEF copies will be given to the regional MEA coordinator for distribution to reviewers, along with the verification forms generated by the MEP Data Collections Office. The regional MEA coordinator chooses the most appropriate reviewer for the verification of eligibility re-interview. It is expected that the verification will be done by a trained reviewer different than the original interviewer. The data specialist maintains a log of who is in charge of completing the verification of each COE for the regional office and distributes the paperwork for completion.

Conducting the Verification Process in the Field All verification of eligibly MUST be done through a face-to-face interview with the original interviewee. The reviewer completing the verification of eligibility should only use phone calls to set up appointments. On the day of the verification, the reviewer in charge can be accompanied by another recruiter or LEA staff member, but not by the same person who originally signed the family. The reviewer doing the verification explains, in a positive manner, the reason why this quality control measure is taking place. If it is determined that a family has departed, the reviewer will document who provided the information using a comment such as: "Departed per aunt, neighbor," etc. The interviewer signs and dates the certification form and moves to the next COE from the random sample. If the reviewer finds an interviewee not at home, he or she makes at least three attempts to locate or meet with the individual before moving to the next COE from the random sample. Each try takes place at different dates and hours of the day and each one is documented in the top section of the verification form. After the third try, the reviewer circles the last visit documentation notation. The reviewer then enters a comment such as: "3 attempts-unable to locate," on the space provided for the parent's signature. The

reviewer signs and dates the verification form. Each field of the verification form in sections IV and V must be completed by the reviewer. If one of the fields does not apply, a N/A notation is used. The reviewer is free to paraphrase any of the questions in order to clarify the meaning of a question to the family, but must not use any leading questions. The DEF is available only to help the reviewer to organize his/her thoughts and understand the eligibility decision prior to the re-interview. The reviewer must not refer to previously recorded facts or show the DEF to the family. At the end of the visit, the reviewer verbally reviews the data entered on the verification form with the interviewee and dates the verification form. If the interviewee is unable to write or sign, a witnessed mark can take the place of the signature. If the interviewee refuses to sign, the reviewer makes a notation of it and the reason, if any reason is given. The lack of a signature has no impact on eligibility or ineligibility and the verification is still considered valid. The reviewer in charge of the eligibility verification has until the end of the month to deliver the completed forms to the respective regional MEA coordinator. Completing Final Paperwork The data specialist uses the electronic spreadsheet for her region contained in the "Monthly Quality Control" Excel document to enter the results of the re-interviews. Information is entered for each randomly selected COE used during the MQC process, whether the verification attempt was successful or not. This Excel document is sent as an electronic attachment to the state ID & R coordinator and the state data collections coordinator by the first Friday of the following month. The regional MEA coordinator compiles a folder that contains the following completed documents: -A hard copy of the "Monthly Quality Control" Excel document, acting as a cover page -Each of the verified DEFs attached to the back of its respective "Verification of Migrant Child/Youth Program Eligibility" form -Each verification form is numbered in the top right corner, in the order in which they were entered in the electronic spreadsheet Copies of the DEFs and the verification forms are mailed to the state ID & R coordinator no later than seven working days after the end of the month. The original folder is filed and available for audit at the regional office. The regional MEA coordinator takes immediate appropriate action facilitating data correction of any misidentified children or families. The data specialist prepares the letters to notify any misidentified families by mail by the beginning of the second week of the following month. The data specialist notifies the appropriate school districts in writing of the misidentified families with a request to remove migrant coding and cease services immediately. The state data collections coordinator removes the misidentified children listed on the Excel document and the regional offices receive the corrected database through the weekly transfer of information. Misidentified children's information is never permanently erased.

For this reporting period, 655 re-interviews were attempted to reach the required 378. 293 were successfully completed, and 281 (95.9%) were found eligible. The state was able to conduct only 293 out of 655 because of high mobility rates (departures) within the sample and/or an inability to find the required interviewee after making three separate attempts at different times of the day.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

In the space below, respond to the following question: Throughout the year, what steps are taken by staff to check that child count data are inputted and updated accurately (and—for systems that merge data—consolidated accurately)?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

At the beginning of each school year and through a process managed at the MEA level by the coordinator, each child enrolled in the previous school year is re-signed. This means each family is contacted, existing data is verified, and updated information is secured. A new COE is not created, unless there has been a new qualifying move. The previous COE is recertified with any updated information or necessary corrections.

As the primary component of its program eligibility monitoring, the state began conducting monthly random samplings of newly identified students in each of its four regional areas in February, 2006. The sampling size has been equal to 5% of the region's previous month's recruitment or at least 10 families, but no more than 20. This process has significantly helped to ensure that child count data are maintained accurately.

At the same time, the state also put in place a request for eligibility re-certification process that now allows any individual with a legitimate concern regarding a child's eligibility for MEP services to petition for an eligibility re-certification on the child. Cases are handled by staff from the regional MEA offices following the same procedures and protocol established for conducting the monthly random samplings.

In addition to a random sample re-interview, at any time during the year and based upon the COE stored in COEstar, a determination of eligibility is relatively simple. The qualifying arrival date (QAD) listed on the COE is tested for the eligibility range. The residency on the COE is verified to be in the state for which the report is run. The age of each child is tested (using the date of birth) to determine if he or she can be counted for funding/services. Additional checks are run to be certain that children are not entered in the database multiple times (even though COEstar data searches and synchronization virtually eliminate this possibility). Examples of additional checks include a comparison of like or nearly like names by looking at other demographic data(e.g.,birth date, grade, gender, mother's maiden name, etc).

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

In the space below, respond to the following question: What final steps are taken by State staff to verify the child counts produced by your student information system(s) are accurate counts of children in Category 1 and Category 2 prior to their submission to ED? The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

COEstar is a separate, but at the same time intergrated component of Georgia's statewide student information collection with appropriate checks and balances performed in an ongoing manner annually. Each spring, the LEAs must match their migrant coding in Student Record to the COEstar system before they are able to sign off on their data submission for the year. This helps to elminate or correct coding and reporting errors in both systems. In addition, the COEstar Performance Reporter is run monthly to be sent to the state MEP director and regional MEA coordinators for review. This report is intended to catch obvious errors continuously throughout the program year rather than waiting until the end of the year.

As a final check for accuracy, the state MEP director is provided the data gleaned by the Performance Reporter in an Excel workbook covering the entire program year. The State MEP Director reviews the data provided looking for anomalies and areas of confusion and/or contradictory data. When errors or problems are noted, immediate consultation with the state data collections coordinator, TROMIK (COEstar provider), and the regional MEA data specialists is initiated by the state director for explanation, review, and correction until the information is considered to be as accurate as possible.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

In the space below, describe those corrective actions or improvements that will be made by the SEA to improve the accuracy of its MEP

eligibility determinations in light of the prospective re-interviewing results.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Since beginning the monthly rolling re-interview process in February, 2006 and at the conclusion of each month's work, a plan is established by the state to address, through corrective actions and improvements, any issues that led to any incorrect eligibility determinations uncovered during the previous month's re-interviews. Such plans are documented in the state's monthly re-interview quality control summary report.

During the reporting period, 9/1/07 to 8/31/08, the state identified 12 (4.10%) children out of 293 whose re-interview information led to the conclusion that they were ineligible for program services. The reasons for changing the eligibility status of these 12 children were: family intends to stay longer than the 12 months allowed for temporary work, the intention of move was for non-agricultural work, the time of the move's QAD was older than the three years allowed, the move was a 'to join move' that exceeded the allowed time for such a move (the three older children arrived a year after the parents' move, and the youngest child arrived almost 25 months after the parents' move), the move was within the school district (this family is still eligible under a previous move), and the children did not move -only the father made the move.

The following is a summary of the corrective actions taken as a result of the rolling re-interview process during the reporting period:

All recruiters at fault were contacted individually and specific re-training was delivered on the problematic areas identified. Additionally, training covering the problematic points discovered during the re-interviews was intergrated into the mandatory ID & R training that all staff responsible for recruiting receive during the year.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

In the space below, discuss any concerns about the accuracy of the reported child counts or the underlying eligibility determinations on

which the counts are based.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The child counts being reported are accurate and are based on an eligibility determination process that is well structured and sound.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.